

### REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-30, were rejected. Claims 1-24 and 26-29 were rejected under Section 102(e) over *Sato*. Claim 25 was rejected under Section 103(a) over *Sato*. And, claim 30 was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of *Sato* and *Steinberg*.

In response to the rejections of the claims, claims 10 and 18 have been amended, as set forth herein, in manners believed to distinguish better the invention of the present application over *Sato*, taken alone, or in combination with *Steinberg*. The rejections of claims 10 and 18, as now-amended, and also of claim 1 is respectfully traversed for reasons that follow.

In general, embodiments of the present invention relate to the modification of an image or audio presentation for the purposes of display, and storage, of modification data separately from image data. Through operation of an embodiment of the present invention, even if an image or audio presentation is modified by a user one or more times for display purposes, the original data file remains substantially unchanged. The likelihood of errors creeping into the data is, as a result, reduced.

*Sato*, in contrast, appears to be directed towards allowing correction of an image created in one device for the purpose of display on another device. See, e.g., the summary section, column 1, of *Sato*.

In the rejection of the claims, the Examiner relies upon column 3 and Figures 1 and 2 of *Sato*. Figure 1 of the reference shows a block diagram of a camera in which an image is initially formed on a CCD 12. The image is subjected to a sequence of processing steps 13-15, 21-27, and, additionally, possibly a compression operation as set forth in column 2, line 45 – column 3, line 35. Subsequent to these processing steps, the image signal is recorded on a memory card M. Thus, the memory card M holds the processed image data in an area M1 and information on the processing steps that resulted in the processed image data in area M2. Adjustments made to the image on CCD12 are made prior to input of the image data on the memory card M.

been made to said image or audio representation after said data was input in the data unit.”

Claims 10 and 18 have been amended to recite analogous structure or methodology.

In other words, *Sato* discloses that adjustments are made to an image prior to input of the image data on a memory card while the present invention, as recited now in the claims, regards adjustments that have been made after the data is input into a data unit.

The Examiner’s reliance upon Figures 2, 4A and 4B and columns 4-6 of *Sato* is further believed to be misplaced with respect to claims 10 and 18, as now-amended.

Figures 3 and 4 of *Sato* appear to show the correction processing (processed) image stored on the memory card M by a first device, for the purposes of display of the image on the LCD 47 of a second device. Column 4, line 52 of the reference explains that the image signal is read from the card M. And, the final paragraph of column 4 explains how image correction processes are performed on the image signal (step 109) and that these are the reverse of the processing steps carried out in Figure 2 of the reference. At step 101 (see also, column 5, lines 48-53) the information on the processing steps from the card M is read from an area M2 and used to carry out the correction processing in step 109 so that the corrected image can subsequently be displayed on the LCD 47.

The information read from the area M2 is the information about the processing steps carried out on the original image in the original device in accordance with Figures 1 and 2. The reference, therefore, plainly shows that the information does not regard “adjustments that have been made to said image after said data was input in the image data unit” as the information relates to adjustments made before the data was stored on the card M.

Additionally, with respect to claim 18, as now-amended, the claim recites that the information stored in the storing step indicates modifications made to the image after storing of the data. Figure 4 includes step 114 of storing the corrected image together with the performed correction process. Consequently, the original image data is no longer available. This step also evidences that *Sato* teaches away from the present invention, as recited now in the claims, as the original image data is retained.

*Steinberg*, relied upon by the Examiner merely for disclosing a display device wherein the image data is transmitted to the display device over a wireless interface, also fails to disclose the structure or methodology of the claims, as now presented.

The dependent claims, which include all the limitations of their respective parent claims, are believed to be patentably distinguishable over *Sato*, taken alone or in combination with *Steinberg* for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claim.

In light of the foregoing, therefore, independent claims 1, 10, and 18, as now-presented, together with the dependent claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 09 August 2005

  
Robert H. Kelly, Registration No. 33,922  
Attorney for Applicant

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.  
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400  
Dallas, Texas 75225  
Telephone: (214) 706-4200  
Fax: (214) 706-4242  
[robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com](mailto:robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com)